arXiv:1409.4666v1 [math.AP] 16 Sep 2014

Solutions to the Navier–Stokes Equations with Mixed Boundary Conditions in Two-Dimensional Bounded Domains

Michal Beneš* and Petr Kučera†

Abstract: In this paper we consider the system of the non–steady Navier–Stokes equations with mixed boundary conditions. We study the existence and uniqueness of a solution of this system. We define Banach spaces X and Y, respectively, to be the space of "possible" solutions of this problem and the space of its data. We define the operator $\mathcal{N} : X \to Y$ and formulate our problem in terms of operator equations. Let $\boldsymbol{u} \in X$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{P}}\boldsymbol{u} : X \to Y$ be the Frechet derivative of $\mathcal{N}$ at $\boldsymbol{u}$. We prove that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{P}}\boldsymbol{u}$ is one-to-one and onto Y. Consequently, suppose that the system is solvable with some given data (the initial velocity and the right hand side). Then there exists a unique solution of this system for data which are small perturbations of the previous ones. Next result proved in the Appendix of this paper is $W^{2,2}$- regularity of solutions of steady Stokes system with mixed boundary condition for sufficiently smooth data.

Keywords: Navier–Stokes equations; Mixed boundary conditions; Qualitative properties

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 35Q30; 35D05

1 Introduction

The NavierStokes equations have been usually solved with the Dirichlet boundary condition. This theory is elaborated in many papers in which there were proved, e.g., the results on the global in time existence of weak solutions, uniqueness of weak solutions in an appropriate function space, global in time existence of strong solutions for sufficiently small initial data and local in time existence of strong solution for arbitrary data. However, the Dirichlet boundary condition is not natural in some situations, e.g. in a finite channel flow model. The Dirichlet boundary condition can be used on the fixed wall and on the input of the channel, but it cannot be prescribed on the output. The reason is the output velocity dependence on the flow in the channel which is not known in advance. Some authors, dealing mostly with numerical methods, use either the condition

$$\nu\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{u}}{\partial \boldsymbol{n}} - \mathcal{P}\boldsymbol{n} = \boldsymbol{0}. \tag{1.1}$$

or

$$-\mathcal{P}\boldsymbol{n} + \frac{\nu}{2}\left(\nabla\boldsymbol{u} + \nabla\boldsymbol{u}^T\right)\cdot\boldsymbol{n} = \boldsymbol{0} \tag{1.2}$$

on the output of the boundary (see e.g. [11] or [25]). Another possibility is to introduce mixed boundary conditions by prescribing the homogeneous Dirichlet conditions on the fixed wall and boundary conditions (1.1) or (1.2) on the input and the output of the channel. The latter conditions do not exclude the possibility of backward flows which could eventually bring an uncontrollable amount of kinetic energy back to the channel. Consequently the energy inequality known from the Navier-Stokes equations with the Dirichlet boundary condition or another equivalent a priori estimate of a weak solution cannot be derived for the Navier-Stokes equations problem with the latter boundary conditions. Due to this fact, the question of the global in time existence of a weak solution of this problem is still open.

Some qualitative properties of the Navier–Stokes equations with these boundary conditions are studied in [16, 17, 18, 20]. In [16]–[18], Kračmar & Neustupa prescribed an additional condition on the output

*Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Civil Engineering, Czech Technical University in Prague, Thákurova 7, 166 29 Prague 6, Czech Republic, E-mail: benes@mat.fsv.cvut.cz

†Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Civil Engineering, Czech Technical University in Prague, Thákurova 7, 166 29 Prague 6, Czech Republic, E-mail: kucera@mat.fsv.cvut.cz

(which bounds the kinetic energy of an eventual backward flow) and formulated steady and evolutionary Navier–Stokes problems by means of appropriate variational inequalities. In [20], Kučera & Skalák proved the local–in–time existence of a strong solution of the nonsteady Navier–Stokes problem with boundary condition (1.6) on the part of the boundary. In this paper, we study the same problem and we prove the global–in–time existence and uniqueness of a strong solution in a small neighbourhood of another known solution.

Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$, $\Omega \in C^{0,1}$ and let Γ_D, Γ_N be open disjoint subsets of $\partial\Omega$ (not necessarily connected) such that $\Gamma_D \neq \emptyset$ and the $\partial\Omega \setminus (\Gamma_D \cup \Gamma_N)$ is a finite set. The domain Ω represents a channel system filled up by a moving fluid, Γ_D is a fixed wall and Γ_N represents the input and output (free-stream surfaces) of the channel. It is assumed that in/outflow pipe segments extend as straight pipes. All portions of Γ_N are taken to be flat and the boundary Γ_N and rigid boundary Γ_D form a right angle at each point $A \in \partial\Omega \setminus (\Gamma_D \cup \Gamma_N)$ (i.e., at the point in which the boundary conditions change their type) (cf. Fig. 1). Moreover, we assume that all parts of Γ_D are smooth (of class C^∞). Let $T \in (0, \infty)$, T is supposed to be fixed value throughout the paper.

The classical formulation of the problem we are going to study is as follows:

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{u}}{\partial t} - \nu\Delta\boldsymbol{u} + (\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla)\boldsymbol{u} + \nabla\mathcal{P} = \boldsymbol{f} \quad \text{in } \Omega\times(0,T), \tag{1.3}$$

$$\operatorname{div}\boldsymbol{u} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega\times(0,T), \tag{1.4}$$

$$\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{0} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_D\times(0,T), \tag{1.5}$$

$$-\mathcal{P}\boldsymbol{n} + \nu\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{u}}{\partial \boldsymbol{n}} = \boldsymbol{0} \quad \text{on } \Gamma_N\times(0,T), \tag{1.6}$$

$$\boldsymbol{u}(0) = \boldsymbol{u}_0 \quad \text{in } \Omega. \tag{1.7}$$

Functions $\boldsymbol{u}$, $\mathcal{P}$, $\boldsymbol{f}$, $\boldsymbol{u}_0$ are smooth enough, $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_1, u_2)$ is velocity, $\mathcal{P}$ represents pressure, ν denotes the viscosity, $\boldsymbol{f}$ is a body force and $\boldsymbol{n} = (n_1, n_2)$ is an outer normal vector. $\boldsymbol{u}_0$ describes an initial velocity and the compatibility condition $\boldsymbol{u}_0 = \boldsymbol{0}$ on Γ_D holds. The problem (1.3)–(1.7) is called the nonsteady Navier–Stokes problem with the mixed boundary conditions. For simplicity we suppose that $\nu = 1$ throughout the paper.

We also comment on the problem, in which (1.4)–(1.7) hold and (1.3) is replaced with the equation

$$\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{u}}{\partial t} - \Delta\boldsymbol{u} + \nabla\mathcal{P} = \boldsymbol{f} \quad \text{in } \Omega\times(0,T). \tag{1.8}$$

The problem (1.4)–(1.7) and (1.8) is called the nonsteady Stokes problem with the mixed boundary conditions.



Figure 1: The domain Ω represents a channel filled up by a moving fluid.

Let us present an outline of the paper. We start with the definitions of some function spaces and the spaces of solutions (the space X) and data (the space Y) of the problem in Section 2. In Section 3 we present some auxiliary results of Stokes and Navier–Stokes problem. We set the problem in the form of an operator equation. In section 4 we present the main result of the paper based on the well known Local

Diffeomorphism Theorem, i.e. the local existence and uniqueness result for the related Navier–Stokes equations with the mixed boundary conditions. In Appendix A we prove the regularity of the solution to the steady Stokes problem with the mixed boundary conditions. We use ideas from Kozlov *et al.* [14].

We shall denote by c a generic constant, i.e. a constant whose value may change from one line to the next one. Numbered constants $c_1, c_2, \dots$ will have fixed values throughout the paper.

2 Definition of some function spaces

Let

$$\mathcal{E}(\overline{\Omega}) := \left\{ \boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\overline{\Omega})^2;\ \operatorname{div} \boldsymbol{u} = 0,\ \operatorname{supp} \boldsymbol{u} \cap \overline{\Gamma_D} = \emptyset \right\}.$$

Let the linear space V_κ and L^2_κ, respectively, be closures of $\mathcal{E}(\overline{\Omega})$ in the norm of $W^{1,2}(\Omega)^2$ and $L^2(\Omega)^2$. Note, that V_κ and L^2_κ are closed subspaces of $W^{1,2}(\Omega)^2$ and $L^2(\Omega)^2$. The scalar product in L^2_κ is the same as in $L^2(\Omega)^2$ and we denote it by $\big(.\,,.\big)$. In V_κ, we use the scalar product

$$\big(\!\big(\boldsymbol{\Phi}, \boldsymbol{\Psi}\big)\!\big) \ := \ \int_\Omega \nabla \boldsymbol{\Phi} \cdot \nabla \boldsymbol{\Psi} \ \mathrm{d}\Omega,$$

which is equivalent to the scalar product in $W^{1,2}(\Omega)^2$. Most of papers solving Navier-Stokes equations with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions define the Hilbert spaces V and H. Sometimes these spaces are denoted also by $W^{1,2}_{0,\sigma}$ and $L^2_\sigma(\Omega)$. The Hilbert spaces V_κ and L^2_κ defined in this paper play corresponding role as V and H,respectively, but are not the same. To distinguish them we use symbol κ.

Let

$$\mathcal{D} := \{\boldsymbol{w} \in V_\kappa;\ \text{there exists } \boldsymbol{f} \in L^2_\kappa \text{ such that } \big(\!\big(\boldsymbol{w}, \boldsymbol{v}\big)\!\big) = \big(\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{v}\big) \text{ for every } \boldsymbol{v} \in V_\kappa\}. \tag{2.1}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{f}_i$ and $\boldsymbol{w}_i$, $i = 1, 2$, are corresponding functions via (2.1). Denote the scalar product $\big(\!\big(.\,,.\big)\!\big)_{\mathcal{D}}$ on $\mathcal{D}$ such that

$$\big(\!\big(\boldsymbol{w}_1, \boldsymbol{w}_2\big)\!\big)_{\mathcal{D}} = \big(\boldsymbol{f}_1, \boldsymbol{f}_2\big). \tag{2.2}$$

Note that $\mathcal{D}$ is the Hilbert space with the scalar product defined by (2.2).

Let $\boldsymbol{w} \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\boldsymbol{f}$ is a corresponding function via (2.1). It is proved in Appendix A that there exists $q \in L^2(\Omega)$ such that couple $(\boldsymbol{w}, q)$ is a solution of the steady Stokes system with mixed boundary conditions (system (A.1)–(A.4)).

Bilinear form $\big(\!\big(.\,,.\big)\!\big)$ is V_κ-eliptic since all functions $\boldsymbol{\phi} \in V_\kappa$ have zero traces on Γ_D, and Γ_D is nonempty open subset of $\partial\Omega$. Hence it can be shown as in [27, Chapter I., Paragraph 2.6] that there exist functions $\boldsymbol{\phi}_1, \boldsymbol{\phi}_2, \dots, \boldsymbol{\phi}_k, \dots \in V_\kappa \subset L^2_\kappa$ and real positive numbers $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots \lambda_k, \dots \to \infty$ for $k \to \infty$, such that

$$\big(\!\big(\boldsymbol{\phi}_k, \boldsymbol{v}\big)\!\big) = \lambda_k \big(\boldsymbol{\phi}_k, \boldsymbol{v}\big)$$

for every $\boldsymbol{v} \in V_\kappa$. $\boldsymbol{\phi}_1, \boldsymbol{\phi}_2, \dots$ is a system which is complete in both L^2_κ and V_κ, orthonormal in L^2_κ and orthogonal in V_κ. It is easy to see that this system is orthogonal and complete in $\mathcal{D}$, too. Further

$$L^2_\kappa = \Big\{ \boldsymbol{v};\ \boldsymbol{v} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \boldsymbol{\phi}_k,\ a_k \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k^2 < \infty \Big\}, \tag{2.3}$$

$$V_\kappa = \Big\{ \boldsymbol{v};\ \boldsymbol{v} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \boldsymbol{\phi}_k,\ a_k \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k a_k^2 < \infty \Big\} \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$\mathcal{D} = \Big\{ \boldsymbol{v};\ \boldsymbol{v} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \boldsymbol{\phi}_k,\ a_k \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and } \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^2 a_k^2 < \infty \Big\}. \tag{2.5}$$

Using (2.3)–(2.5) we get

$$\mathcal{D} \hookrightarrow\hookrightarrow V_\kappa. \tag{2.6}$$

In Appendix A we prove the following embedding

$$\mathcal{D} \hookrightarrow W^{2,2}(\Omega). \tag{2.7}$$

Further we introduce the following Banach spaces

$$X := \left\{\boldsymbol{\varphi};\ \boldsymbol{\varphi} \in L^2(0,T;\mathcal{D}),\ \boldsymbol{\varphi}' \in L^2(0,T;L^2_\kappa)\right\}$$

and

$$Y := \left\{[\boldsymbol{g};\boldsymbol{\omega}];\ \boldsymbol{g} \in L^2(0,T;L^2_\kappa),\ \boldsymbol{\omega} \in V_\kappa\right\},$$

respectively, equipped with the norms

$$\|\boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_X := \|\boldsymbol{\varphi}\|_{L^2(0,T;\mathcal{D})} + \|\boldsymbol{\varphi}'\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2_\kappa)}$$

and

$$\|[\boldsymbol{g};\boldsymbol{\omega}]\|_Y := \|\boldsymbol{g}\|_{L^2(0,T,L^2_\kappa)} + \|\boldsymbol{\omega}\|_{V_\kappa}.$$

We denote zero elements of X and Y by $\mathbf{0}_X$ and $\mathbf{0}_Y$, respectively. Let us present some properties of the space X which will be used later. It is easy to see that $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in X$ if and only if

$$\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \vartheta_k(t)\boldsymbol{\phi}_k$$

for almost every $t \in (0,T)$ and

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T \left(\lambda_k^2 \vartheta_k^2(t) + \vartheta_k'^2(t)\right)\, dt < \infty. \tag{2.8}$$

Therefore

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)\|^2_{V_\kappa} = 2\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k \vartheta_k(t)\vartheta_k'(t)$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)\|^2_{L^2_\kappa} = 2\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \vartheta_k(t)\vartheta_k'(t)$$

for almost every $t \in (0,T)$. Using (2.8) we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)\|^2_{L^2_\kappa} \in L^1([0,T]) \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{\varphi}(t)\|^2_{V_\kappa} \in L^1([0,T]). \tag{2.10}$$

The fact that $\boldsymbol{\varphi} \in L^2(0,T;\mathcal{D}) \hookrightarrow L^2(0,T;V_\kappa)$ and (2.10) imply

$$X \hookrightarrow L^\infty(0,T;V_\kappa) \tag{2.11}$$

and

$$X \subset \mathfrak{C}(0,T;V_\kappa).$$

Using the embeddings (2.7) and [22, Theorem 5.8.2] we obtain the embeddings

$$\mathcal{D} \hookrightarrow W^{2,2}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow\hookrightarrow W^{1,6}(\Omega)^2 \hookrightarrow\hookrightarrow L^2(\Omega)^2. \tag{2.12}$$

(Note that by (2.7) $\mathcal{D} \hookrightarrow\hookrightarrow W^{1,p}(\Omega)^2$ for every $p > 1$, but the embedding $\mathcal{D} \hookrightarrow\hookrightarrow W^{1,6}(\Omega)^2$ is sufficient for our aim now). By [27, Chapter III, Theorem 2.1.] and (2.12) we get

$$X \hookrightarrow\hookrightarrow L^2(0,T;W^{1,6}(\Omega)^2).$$

This embedding, (2.11), [22, Theorem 5.8.2] and the interpolation between the spaces V_κ and $W^{1,6}(\Omega)^2$ yield the embeddings

$$X \hookrightarrow\hookrightarrow L^4(0,T;W^{1,3}(\Omega)^2) \hookrightarrow L^4(0,T;L^q(\Omega)^2) \tag{2.13}$$

for $1 \le q < \infty$.

3 The nonstationary Stokes and Navier–Stokes equations with the mixed boundary conditions

Let us start this section with the definition of a generalized solution to the linearized problem.

Definition 3.1 *Let $\boldsymbol{f} \in L^2(0,T;\, L^2_\kappa)$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_0 \in V_\kappa$. Then $\boldsymbol{u}$ is a generalized solution of the Stokes problem (1.4)– (1.8) with the right hand side $\boldsymbol{f}$ and the initial condition $\boldsymbol{u}_0$ if and only if*

$$\big(\boldsymbol{u}'(t), \boldsymbol{v}\big) + \big(\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t), \boldsymbol{v}\big)\big) = \big(\boldsymbol{f}(t), \boldsymbol{v}\big) \tag{3.1}$$

for every $\boldsymbol{v} \in V_\kappa$ and for almost every $t \in (0,T)$ and

$$\boldsymbol{u}(0) = \boldsymbol{u}_0. \tag{3.2}$$

Definition 3.2 *The operator $\mathcal{S} : X \to Y$ is defined by*

$$\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{u}) := \Big[\big(\boldsymbol{u}',\, .\big) + \big(\big(\boldsymbol{u}, .\big)\big);\, \boldsymbol{u}(0)\Big].$$

Remark 3.3 *Let $\boldsymbol{u} \in X$ and $[\boldsymbol{f};\, \boldsymbol{u}_0] \in Y$. Then $\boldsymbol{u}$ is the generalized solution of the Stokes problem (1.4)–(1.8) with the right hand side $\boldsymbol{f}$ and the initial condition $\boldsymbol{u}_0$ if and only if $\mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{u}) = [\boldsymbol{f};\, \boldsymbol{u}_0]$.*

It is obvious that $\mathcal{S}$ is the continuous operator. In the following theorem we prove that $\mathcal{S}$ is the one-to-one operator and onto Y.

Theorem 3.4 *Let $\boldsymbol{f} \in L^2(0,T;\, L^2_\kappa)$, $\boldsymbol{u}_0 \in V_\kappa$. There exists the unique generalized solution $\boldsymbol{u} \in X$ of the Stokes problem with the mixed boundary conditions and with data $\boldsymbol{f}$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_0$. Moreover, the following estimate holds*

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^2(0,T;\,\mathcal{D})} + \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;\,V_\kappa)} + \|\boldsymbol{u}'\|_{L^2(0,T;\,L^2_\kappa)} \le\ c_1\Big(\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_{L^2(0,T;\,L^2_\kappa)} + \|\boldsymbol{u}_0\|_{V_\kappa}\Big). \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. Since $\boldsymbol{f} \in L^2(0,T;\, L^2_\kappa)$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_0 \in V_\kappa$, we have

$$\boldsymbol{f} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mu_k(t)\boldsymbol{\phi}_k, \qquad \boldsymbol{u}_0 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k \boldsymbol{\phi}_k, \tag{3.4}$$

where

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T \mu_k^2(t)\, dt + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k^2 < \infty. \tag{3.5}$$

(Meaning of (3.4) is that $\boldsymbol{f} = \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \mu_k(t)\boldsymbol{\phi}_k$ in $L^2(0,T;\, L^2_\kappa)$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_0 = \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k\boldsymbol{\phi}_k$ in V_κ.) Let ϑ_k be a solution of the ordinary differential equation

$$\vartheta_k'(t) + \lambda_k \vartheta_k(t) = \mu_k(t) \tag{3.6}$$

(which holds for almost every $t \in (0,T)$) with the initial condition

$$\vartheta_k(0) = a_k \tag{3.7}$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ Then

$$\vartheta_k(t) = \int_0^t e^{\lambda_k(s-t)} \mu_k(s)\, ds + a_k e^{-\lambda_k t}$$

for every $t \in (0,T)$. Hence $\vartheta_k \in W^{1,2}((0,t))$. Multiplying (3.6) by $2\vartheta_k'$ and integrating over $(0,t)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2\int_0^t {\vartheta_k'}^2(s)\, ds + \lambda_k \vartheta_k^2(t) &= \lambda_k {\vartheta_k}^2(0) + 2\int_0^t \mu_k(s)\vartheta_k{}'(s)\, ds \\ &\le \lambda_k \vartheta_k^2(0) + \int_0^t {\vartheta_k}'^2(s)\, ds + \int_0^t \mu_k^2(s)\, ds \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

for $k = 1, 2, \dots$ and for every $t \in (0, T)$ and therefore

$$\int_0^t \vartheta_k'^{\,2}(s)\, ds + \lambda_k \vartheta_k^2(t) \le \lambda_k \vartheta_k^2(0) + \int_0^t \mu_k^2(s)\, ds. \tag{3.9}$$

Thus (3.9) yields

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_0^t \vartheta_k'^{\,2}(s)\, ds + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k \vartheta_k^2(t) \le \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T \vartheta_k'^{\,2}(s)\, ds + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k \vartheta_k^2(t)$$
$$\le 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k \vartheta_k^2(0) + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T \mu_k^2(s)\, ds \tag{3.10}$$

for every $t \in (0, T)$ (remind that k doesn't depend on t) and therefore we get

$$\boldsymbol{u} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \vartheta_k(t) \boldsymbol{\phi}_k \in L^\infty(0, T;\, V_\kappa), \quad \boldsymbol{u}' \in L^2(0, T;\, L^2_\kappa) \tag{3.11}$$

and the generalized solution $\boldsymbol{u}$ satisfies the inequality

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\infty(0,T;\, V_\kappa)} + \|\boldsymbol{u}'\|_{L^2(0,T;\, L^2_\kappa)} \le 2\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_{L^2(0,T;\, L^2_\kappa)} + 2\|\boldsymbol{u}_0\|_{V_\kappa}. \tag{3.12}$$

(3.6) yields also inequalities

$$\lambda_k^2 \vartheta_k^2(t) \le 2\mu_k^2(t) + 2\vartheta_k'^2(t)$$

for every $k = 1, 2, \dots$ and for almost every $t \in (0, T)$. Therefore we get

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^2 \int_0^t \vartheta_k^2(s)\, ds \le \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^2 \int_0^T \vartheta_k^2(s)\, ds \le 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T \mu_k^2(s)\, ds + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T \vartheta_k'^2(s)\, ds.$$

The last inequality and (3.10) yield

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^2 \int_0^t \vartheta_k^2(s)\, ds \le \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k^2 \int_0^T \vartheta_k^2(s)\, ds \le 6 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \int_0^T \mu_k^2(s)\, ds + 4 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \lambda_k \vartheta_k^2(0) \tag{3.13}$$

for every $t \in (0, T)$. Therefore one obtains

$$\boldsymbol{u} \in L^2(0, T;\, \mathcal{D}).$$

Moreover, (3.13) implies the estimate

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^2(0,T;\, \mathcal{D})} \le c_2 \Big(\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_{L^2(0,T;\, L^2_\kappa)} + \|\boldsymbol{u}_0\|_{V_\kappa} \Big).$$

The last inequality and (3.12) imply (3.3). It is easy to see that $\boldsymbol{u} \in X$ and

$$\big(\boldsymbol{u}'(t), \boldsymbol{v}\big) + \big(\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t), \boldsymbol{v}\big)\big) = \big(\boldsymbol{f}(t), \boldsymbol{v}\big)$$

for every $\boldsymbol{v} \in V_\kappa$ and for almost every $t \in (0, T)$ and that

$$\boldsymbol{u}(0) = \boldsymbol{u}_0.$$

The existence of the unique generalized solution $\boldsymbol{u}$ for given data $\boldsymbol{f}$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_0$ will now be proven. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{u}_A, \boldsymbol{u}_B \in X$ are solutions of this problem for given data $\boldsymbol{f}$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_0$. We prove that $\boldsymbol{u}_A = \boldsymbol{u}_B$.

Denote $\boldsymbol{w} = \boldsymbol{u}_A - \boldsymbol{u}_B$. Then

$$\big(\boldsymbol{w}'(t), \boldsymbol{v}\big) + \big(\big(\boldsymbol{w}(t), \boldsymbol{v}\big)\big) = 0 \tag{3.14}$$

for every $\boldsymbol{v} \in V_\kappa$ and for almost every $t \in (0, T)$ and

$$\boldsymbol{w}(0) = \boldsymbol{0}. \tag{3.15}$$

Multiplying (3.14) by $\boldsymbol{w}(t)$, integrating over $(0, T)$ and using (2.9) and (3.15) we obtain

$$\|\boldsymbol{w}(T)\|^2_{L^2_\kappa} + \int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{w}(t)\|^2_{V_\kappa}\, dt = 0. \tag{3.16}$$

Therefore we get $\boldsymbol{w} = \boldsymbol{0}_X$ and consequently $\boldsymbol{u}_A = \boldsymbol{u}_B$. This completes the proof.

If $\boldsymbol{\theta},\ \boldsymbol{\psi},\ \boldsymbol{\phi} \in V_\kappa$, then $b(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \boldsymbol{\phi})$ denotes the trilinear form

$$b(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \boldsymbol{\phi}) = \int_\Omega \theta_j \frac{\partial \psi_i}{\partial x_j} \phi_i \, \mathrm{d}\Omega. \tag{3.17}$$

The summation convention is used for repeated indices.

Remark 3.5 *Let $\boldsymbol{\theta},\ \boldsymbol{\psi} \in \mathcal{D}$ then $b(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, .) \in L^2_\kappa$. If $\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{w} \in L^2(0,T;\, \mathcal{D}) \cap L^\infty(0,T;\, V_\kappa)$ then $b(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{w}, .) = b(\boldsymbol{u}(t), \boldsymbol{w}(t), .) \in L^2(0,T;\, L^2_\kappa)$. Moreover,*

$$\|b(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{w}, .)\|_{L^2(0,T;\, L^2_\kappa)} \leq\ c_3\ \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_X \|\boldsymbol{w}\|_X. \tag{3.18}$$

Now we set up a generalized formulation of the Navier–Stokes problem.

Definition 3.6 *Let $\boldsymbol{f} \in L^2(0,T;\, L^2_\kappa)$, $\boldsymbol{u}_0 \in V_\kappa$. Then $\boldsymbol{u} \in L^2(0,T;\, \mathcal{D}) \cap L^\infty(0,T;\, V_\kappa)$ with $\boldsymbol{u}' \in L^2(0,T;\, L^2_\kappa)$ is called a generalized solution of the problem (1.3) – (1.7) on $(0,T)$ (a generalized solution of the Navier–Stokes problem with the mixed boundary conditions) with data $\boldsymbol{f}$ and $\boldsymbol{u}_0$ if and only if*

$$\big(\boldsymbol{u}'(t), \boldsymbol{v}\big) + \big(\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t), \boldsymbol{v}\big)\big) + b(\boldsymbol{u}(t), \boldsymbol{u}(t), \boldsymbol{v}) = \big(\boldsymbol{f}(t), \boldsymbol{v}\big) \tag{3.19}$$

holds for all $\boldsymbol{v} \in V_\kappa$ and for almost every $t \in (0,T)$, and

$$\boldsymbol{u}(0) = \boldsymbol{u}_0. \tag{3.20}$$

Define the operator $\mathcal{N} : X \to Y$ given by

$$\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{u}) := \left[\big(\boldsymbol{u}'(t), .\big) + \big(\big(\boldsymbol{u}(t), .\big)\big) + b(\boldsymbol{u}(t), \boldsymbol{u}(t), .);\ \boldsymbol{u}(0)\right]. \tag{3.21}$$

Remark 3.7 *Let $\boldsymbol{u} \in X$ and $[\boldsymbol{f};\, \boldsymbol{u}_0] \in Y$. The generalized problem can now be treated as one operator equation*

$$\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{u}) = [\boldsymbol{f};\, \boldsymbol{u}_0].$$

Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be a fixed point in X. Let $\mathcal{B}_u : X \to Y$ be a linear operator defined by

$$\mathcal{B}_u(\boldsymbol{w}) := \left[b(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{w}, .) + b(\boldsymbol{w}, \boldsymbol{u}, .);\ \boldsymbol{0}\right]. \tag{3.22}$$

Theorem 3.8 *Let $\boldsymbol{u}$ be some arbitrary fixed element in X. The operator $\mathcal{G}_u : X \to Y$ given by*

$$\mathcal{G}_u(\boldsymbol{w}) := \mathcal{S}(\boldsymbol{w}) + \mathcal{B}_u(\boldsymbol{w}) \tag{3.23}$$

is the Fréchet derivative of $\mathcal{N}$ at the point $\boldsymbol{u}$, $\mathcal{G}_u \in \mathcal{C}(X \times X, Y)$ and $\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}^1(X, Y)$.

Proof. Since

$$\|\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{w}) - \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{u}) - \mathcal{G}_u(\boldsymbol{w})\|_Y = \|[b(\boldsymbol{w}, \boldsymbol{w}, .);\ \boldsymbol{0}]\|_Y \tag{3.24}$$

and (3.18) yields the estimate

$$\|[b(\boldsymbol{w}, \boldsymbol{w}, .);\ \boldsymbol{0}]\|_Y \leq\ c_3\ \|\boldsymbol{w}\|^2_X, \tag{3.25}$$

we get

$$\lim_{\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_X \to 0} \frac{\|\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{w}) - \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{u}) - \mathcal{G}_u(\boldsymbol{w})\|_Y}{\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_X} = 0.$$

$\mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{C}^1(X, Y)$ and the smoothness $\mathcal{G}_u \in \mathcal{C}(X \times X, Y)$ is obvious. The proof is complete.

4 Main result

We can now state the main result of the paper.

Theorem 4.1 (Main result) *Let $\boldsymbol{u} \in X$, $[\boldsymbol{f};\, \boldsymbol{u}_0] \in Y$ and $\boldsymbol{u}$ be the generalized solution of the Navier–Stokes initial–boundary value problem with right hand side $\boldsymbol{f}$ and initial velocity $\boldsymbol{u}_0$, formulated by the operator equation $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{u}) = [\boldsymbol{f};\, \boldsymbol{u}_0]$. Then there exist open sets $\mathcal{U} \subset X$ and $\mathcal{V} \subset Y$ such that $\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}$, $[\boldsymbol{f};\, \boldsymbol{u}_0] \in \mathcal{V}$ and for every $[\widetilde{\boldsymbol{f}};\, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}_0] \in \mathcal{V}$ there exists unique $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} \in \mathcal{U}$ which is a generalized solution of the Navier-Stokes initial–boundary value problem with right hand side $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{f}}$ and initial velocity $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}_0}$, formulated by the operator equation $\mathcal{N}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}) = [\widetilde{\boldsymbol{f}};\, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}_0]$. Conversely, let $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} \in \mathcal{U}$. Then there exists unique $[\boldsymbol{f};\, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}}_0] \in \mathcal{V}$ such that $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}} \in \mathcal{U}$ is a generalized solution of the Navier-Stokes initial–boundary value problem with right hand side $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{f}}$ and initial velocity $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{u}_0}$.*

We prepare the following lemmas and propositions to prove our main result which is postponed to the end of this section.

Lemma 4.2 *Let $\boldsymbol{u} \in X$. Then $\mathcal{B}_u$ is a compact operator from X into Y.*

Proof. Let $\{\boldsymbol{w}_n\} \subset X$ be a bounded sequence. We prove that there exists a subsequence $\{\boldsymbol{w}_{n_k}\}$ of $\{\boldsymbol{w}_n\}$ and $\boldsymbol{w} \in X$ such that $b(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{w}_{n_k}, .) + b(\boldsymbol{w}_{n_k}, \boldsymbol{u}, .) \to b(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{w}, .) + b(\boldsymbol{w}, \boldsymbol{u}, .)$ in $L^2(0,T;\, L^2_\kappa)$.

Since X is reflexive and $\{\boldsymbol{w}_n\}$ is bounded in X, there exists a subsequence $\{\boldsymbol{w}_{n_k}\}$ and $\boldsymbol{w} \in X$ such that

$$\boldsymbol{w}_{n_k} \to \boldsymbol{w} \qquad \text{weakly in } X.$$

Using (2.13) we obtain

$$\boldsymbol{w}_{n_k} \to \boldsymbol{w} \qquad \text{in } L^4(0,T;\, W^{1,3}(\Omega)^2) \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{u} \in L^4(0,T;\, W^{1,3}(\Omega)^2).$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla)(\boldsymbol{w}_{n_k} - \boldsymbol{w})\|^2_{L^2(0,T;\, L^2_\kappa)} &\le c \int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2_{L^6(\Omega)^2} \|\nabla(\boldsymbol{w}_{n_k} - \boldsymbol{w})\|^2_{L^3(\Omega)^2}\, \mathrm{d}t \\
&\le c \left(\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{u}\|^4_{L^6(\Omega)^2}\, \mathrm{d}t \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n_k} - \boldsymbol{w}\|^4_{W^{1,3}(\Omega)^2)}\, \mathrm{d}t \right)^{1/2} \\
&\le c\, \|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2_{L^4(0,T;\, W^{1,3}(\Omega)^2)} \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n_k} - \boldsymbol{w}\|^2_{L^4(0,T;\, W^{1,3}(\Omega)^2)},
\end{aligned}$$

(4.1) implies that

$$\|(\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla)(\boldsymbol{w}_{n_k} - \boldsymbol{w})\|_{L^2(0,T;\, L^2_\kappa)} \to 0. \tag{4.2}$$

The same way, the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
\|((\boldsymbol{w}_{n_k} - \boldsymbol{w})\cdot\nabla)\boldsymbol{u}\|^2_{L^2(0,T;\, L^2_\kappa)} &\le c \int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n_k} - \boldsymbol{w}\|^2_{L^6(\Omega)^2} \|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}\|^2_{L^3(\Omega)^2}\, \mathrm{d}t \\
&\le c \left(\int_0^T \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n_k} - \boldsymbol{w}\|^4_{L^6(\Omega)^2}\, \mathrm{d}t \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_0^T \|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}\|^4_{L^3(\Omega)^2}\, \mathrm{d}t \right)^{1/2} \\
&\le c\, \|\boldsymbol{w}_{n_k} - \boldsymbol{w}\|^2_{L^4(0,T;\, W^{1,3}(\Omega)^2)} \|\boldsymbol{u}\|^2_{L^4(0,T;\, W^{1,3}(\Omega)^2}
\end{aligned}$$

and (4.1) imply

$$\|((\boldsymbol{w}_{n_k} - \boldsymbol{w})\cdot\nabla)\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^2(0,T;\, L^2_\kappa)} \to 0. \tag{4.3}$$

Therefore

$$\|(\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla)(\boldsymbol{w}_{n_k} - \boldsymbol{w}) + ((\boldsymbol{w}_{n_k} - \boldsymbol{w})\cdot\nabla)\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^2(0,T;\, L^2_\kappa)} \to 0.$$

It is easy to see that

$$\mathcal{B}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\boldsymbol{w}_{n_k}) \to \mathcal{B}_{\boldsymbol{u}}(\boldsymbol{w}) \quad \text{ in } Y.$$

The proof is complete.

Lemma 4.3 *Let $\boldsymbol{u} \in X$. $\mathcal{G}_u$ is an injective operator from X to Y.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{G}_u(\boldsymbol{w}) = \mathbf{0}_Y$. Then

$$\big(\boldsymbol{w}'(t), \boldsymbol{v}\big) + \big(\big(\boldsymbol{w}(t), \boldsymbol{v}\big)\big) + b(\boldsymbol{w}(t), \boldsymbol{u}(t), \boldsymbol{v}) + b(\boldsymbol{u}(t), \boldsymbol{w}(t), \boldsymbol{v}) \;=\; 0$$

holds for all $\boldsymbol{v} \in V_\kappa$ and every $t \in (0,T)$ and $\boldsymbol{w}(0) \equiv \mathbf{0}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{w}(t)\|^2_{L^2_\kappa} + \|\nabla \boldsymbol{w}(t)\|^2_{L^2_\kappa} &\leq |b(\boldsymbol{u}(t), \boldsymbol{w}(t), \boldsymbol{w}(t))| + |b(\boldsymbol{w}(t), \boldsymbol{u}(t), \boldsymbol{w}(t))| \\
&\leq \|\nabla \boldsymbol{w}(t)\|^{7/4}_{L^2(\Omega)^2} \|\boldsymbol{w}(t)\|^{1/4}_{L^2_\kappa} \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{L^4(\Omega)^2} \\
&\quad + \|\nabla \boldsymbol{w}(t)\|^{3/2}_{L^2(\Omega)^2} \|\boldsymbol{w}(t)\|^{1/2}_{L^2_\kappa} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)^2} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla \boldsymbol{w}(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)^2} + c\,\|\boldsymbol{w}(t)\|^2_{L^2_\kappa} \|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|^8_{L^4(\Omega)^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla \boldsymbol{w}(t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)^2} + c\,\|\boldsymbol{w}(t)\|^2_{L^2_\kappa} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|^4_{L^2(\Omega)^2}
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\boldsymbol{w}(t)\|^2_{L^2_\kappa} \leq c\,\|\boldsymbol{w}(t)\|^2_{L^2_\kappa} \left(\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|^8_{L^4(\Omega)^2} + \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|^4_{L^2(\Omega)^2}\right). \tag{4.4}$$

It is easy to see that $\left(\|\boldsymbol{u}(t)\|^8_{L^4(\Omega)^2} + \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|^4_{L^2(\Omega)^2}\right) \in L^1((0,T))$ and $\|\boldsymbol{w}(0)\|^2_{L^2_\kappa} = 0$. Using Gronwall's lemma, we obtain $\boldsymbol{w} \equiv \mathbf{0}$. The proof is complete.

We remind the well known Local Diffeomorphism Theorem.

Theorem 4.4 *Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be Banach spaces, f be a mapping from $\mathcal{X}$ into $\mathcal{Y}$ belonging to $\mathcal{C}^1$ in some neighborhood V of a point $\boldsymbol{u}$. If $f'(\boldsymbol{u}) : X \to Y$ is one-to-one and onto $\mathcal{Y}$ and continuous, then there exists a neighborhood U of point $\boldsymbol{u}$, $U \subset V$ and a neighborhood W of point $f(\boldsymbol{u})$, $W \subset \mathcal{Y}$ such that f is one-to-one from V onto W.*

The following theorem plays crucial role in the proof of our main result (see [26, Theorem 5.5.F]).

Theorem 4.5 *Let $\mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{Y}$ be Banach spaces, $\mathcal{F}_o$ be a one-to-one operator from $\mathcal{X}$ onto $\mathcal{Y}$, $\mathcal{F}_c$ be a compact linear operator $\mathcal{X}$ into $\mathcal{Y}$. The following statements are equivalent:*

(a) $\mathcal{F}_o + \mathcal{F}_c$ is an injective operator

(b) $\mathcal{F}_o + \mathcal{F}_c$ is an operator onto $\mathcal{Y}$.

Proof of Theorem 4.1 $\mathcal{G}_u$ is a sum of the operators $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{B}_u$. Note that $\mathcal{S} : X \to Y$ is the one-to-one operator and onto Y and $\mathcal{B}_u : X \to Y$ is a compact operator. Moreover $\mathcal{G}_u = \mathcal{S} + \mathcal{B}_u$ is a one-to-one mapping. Using Theorem 4.5 and Lemma 4.3 we get that $\mathcal{G}_u$ is a one-to-one operator and onto Y. The continuity of $\mathcal{G}_u$ is obvious. Finally, Theorem 4.4 yields the assertion.

Remark 4.6 (Uniqueness of the operator $\mathcal{N}$) *Let $\boldsymbol{u}_1, \boldsymbol{u}_2 \in X, \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{u}_1) = \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{u}_2)$, then $\boldsymbol{u}_1 = \boldsymbol{u}_2$.*

Sketch of the proof Denote $\boldsymbol{w} = \boldsymbol{u}_1 - \boldsymbol{u}_2$ then

$$[\big(\boldsymbol{w}'(t), \boldsymbol{v}\big) + \big(\boldsymbol{w}(t), \boldsymbol{v}\big)\big) + \boldsymbol{b}(\boldsymbol{w}(t), \boldsymbol{u}_2(t), \boldsymbol{v}) + \boldsymbol{b}(\boldsymbol{u}_1(t), \boldsymbol{w}(t), \boldsymbol{v});\, \boldsymbol{w}(0)] = \mathbf{0}_Y.$$

Using procedure similar to that in the proof of Lemma 4.3 we get $\boldsymbol{w} = \boldsymbol{u}_1 - \boldsymbol{u}_2 = \mathbf{0}_X$.

A The steady Stokes problem with mixed boundary conditions

In this appendix we prove some results on the regularity of the steady Stokes system with mixed boundary conditions. We further use these results in order to prove the continuous embedding (2.7).

Let us consider the boundary value problem

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\Delta\boldsymbol{\vartheta}+\nabla q &= \boldsymbol{\sigma} \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega, && \text{(A.1)}\\
\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\vartheta} &= 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega, && \text{(A.2)}\\
\boldsymbol{\vartheta} &= \mathbf{0} \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_D, && \text{(A.3)}\\
-q\boldsymbol{n}+\frac{\partial\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}{\partial\boldsymbol{n}} &= \mathbf{0} \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_N, && \text{(A.4)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}=(\vartheta_1,\vartheta_2)$ denotes the velocity field, q is the associated pressure and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in L^2(\Omega)^2$ is a body force.

A pair $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta},q)\in V_\kappa\times L^2(\Omega)$ is called the weak solution of the problem (A.1)–(A.4) if $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}$ satisfies

$$((\boldsymbol{\vartheta},\boldsymbol{v}))=\langle\boldsymbol{\sigma},\boldsymbol{v}\rangle \tag{A.5}$$

for all $\boldsymbol{v}\in V_\kappa$ and $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}$ and q satisfy the equation (A.1) in Ω in the sense of distributions. Here $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ denotes the duality between V_κ and V_κ^*. Since bilinear form $((.,.))$ is V_κ-elliptic there exists a unique $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}\in V_\kappa$ such that (A.5) holds. By [27, Chapter I, Proposition 1.2.] there exists $q\in L^2(\Omega)$ such that equation (A.1) is satisfied in the sense of distributions and

$$\|\boldsymbol{\vartheta}\|_{V_\kappa}+\|q\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\le c_4\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^2}, \tag{A.6}$$

where $c_4=c_4(\Omega)$. Our aim is to prove the next theorem, which immediately implies (2.7).

Theorem A.1 *Let $\boldsymbol{\sigma}\in L^2(\Omega)^2$ and $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta},q)$ be a weak solution of* (A.1)–(A.4) *with the right hand side $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. Then $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta},q)$ belongs to $W^{2,2}(\Omega)^2\times W^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Moreover,*

$$\|\boldsymbol{\vartheta}\|_{W^{2,2}(\Omega)^2}+\|q\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega)}\le c_5\,\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^2} \tag{A.7}$$

with some constant $c_5=c_5(\Omega)$.

Note that the system (A.1)–(A.4) represents an elliptic boundary value problem in the sense of Agmon, Douglis and Nirenberg [1, Chapter I.1.] and [10, Part III., Chapter 1., Section 1.4.]. The general questions about solvability (Fredholm's property) and regularity of solutions to the linear elliptic boundary value problems in domains with corners are solved for instance in [12] by Kondrat'ev, in [14, 15] by Kozlov *et al.* and in [21] by Kufner and Sändig.

Let Ω_1, Ω_2 be arbitrary open sets such that $\Omega_1\subset\overline{\Omega}_1\subset\Omega_2\subset\overline{\Omega}_2\subset\Omega$. By [9, Theorem IV.4.1] the pair $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta},q)$ belongs to $W^{2,2}(\Omega_1)^2\times W^{1,2}(\Omega_1)$ and

$$\|\boldsymbol{\vartheta}\|_{W^{2,2}(\Omega_1)^2}+\|q\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega_1)}\le\ c_6\ (\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{L^2(\Omega_2)^2}+\|q\|_{L(\Omega_2)}+\|\boldsymbol{\vartheta}\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega_2)^2}),$$

where $c_6=c_6(\Omega_1,\Omega_2)$. This estimate and (A.6) imply

$$\|\boldsymbol{\vartheta}\|_{W^{2,2}(\Omega_1)^2}+\|q\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega_1)}\le\ c_7\ \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^2}, \tag{A.8}$$

where $c_7=c_7(\Omega_1,\Omega)$.

In order to show that the solution is locally regular at points P on Γ_N, we use an appropriate infinitely differentiable cut–off function, which equals 1 in a small neighbourhood $U_\tau(P)$ ($U_\tau(P)$ denotes the ball of radius τ centered at the point P) and 0 outside $U_{2\tau}(P)$, whose values are between 0 and 1 in $U_{2\tau}(P)\setminus U_\tau(P)$ and which depends only on the distance from point P. Multiplying equation (A.1) by this cut–off function and using the assumption that Γ_N is a (open) line segment, we transform the problem (A.1)–(A.4) to the system

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\Delta\boldsymbol{\vartheta}'+\nabla q' &= \boldsymbol{\sigma}' \quad \text{in } \Omega_3, && \text{(A.9)}\\
\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\vartheta}' &= \chi' \quad \text{in } \Omega_3, && \text{(A.10)}\\
-q'\boldsymbol{n}+\frac{\partial\boldsymbol{\vartheta}'}{\partial\boldsymbol{n}} &= \mathbf{0} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega_3, && \text{(A.11)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\Omega_3\subset\Omega$ is an appropriate smooth domain containing $U_{2\tau}(P)\cap\Omega$, $\boldsymbol{\sigma}'\in L^2(\Omega_3)^3$ and $\chi'\in W^{1,2}(\Omega_3)$. The new unknown functions $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}'$ and q', respectively, coincide with $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}$ and q in $U_\tau(P)$. Moreover,

$$\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}'\|_{L^2(\Omega_3)^2}+\|\chi'\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega_3)}\le c\,\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^2}. \tag{A.12}$$

(This cut–off function procedure is described in greater detail e.g. in [3, Theorem D.1].) The system (A.9)–(A.11) is of the Agmon-Douglis-Nirenberg type (ADN). Using the regularity theory for elliptic systems in smooth domains (cf. [1], [3, Theorem D.1]), we deduce that any weak solution of $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}', q')$ of (A.9)–(A.11) belongs to $W^{2,2}(\Omega_3)^2 \times W^{1,2}(\Omega_3)$ and satisfies the estimate

$$\|\boldsymbol{\vartheta}'\|_{W^{2,2}(\Omega_3)^2} + \|q'\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega_3)} \leq c\,(\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{L^2(\Omega_3)^2} + \|\chi'\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega_3)} + \|\boldsymbol{\vartheta}\|_{L^2(\Omega_3)^2}).$$

This estimate, (A.6) and (A.12) imply that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\vartheta}\|_{W^{2,2}(\Omega_N)^2} + \|q\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega_N)} \leq c_8 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^2}, \tag{A.13}$$

$\Omega_N = \Omega \cap U_\tau(P)$, which confirms that the solution $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, q)$ is regular in the neighbourhood of point P, $c_8 = c_8(\Omega_N)$.

In order to show that the solution is locally regular at points P on Γ_D, we apply the analogous cut-off function technique with the only difference that the boundary condition is

$$\boldsymbol{\vartheta} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{ on } \partial\Omega_D, \tag{A.14}$$

where Ω_D is an appropriate smooth domain in $U_{2\tau}(P) \cap \Omega$, and we obtain the estimate

$$\|\boldsymbol{\vartheta}\|_{W^{2,2}(\Omega_D)^2} + \|q\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega_D)} \leq c_9 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^2}, \tag{A.15}$$

where $c_9 = c_9(\Omega_D)$.

A.1 Local regularity at the point in which the boundary conditions change their type

We have explained that the weak solution $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, q)$ of problem of (A.1)–(A.4) belongs to $W^{2,2}_{loc}(\Omega)^2 \times W^{1,2}_{loc}(\Omega)$ and satisfies (A.8). Furthermore, this solution is "locally regular" in the neighborhood of an arbitrary point P in $\Gamma_D \cup \Gamma_N$. To prove that the solution $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, q)$ is "globally regular", we need to show that it is "locally regular" at the point A, where the boundary conditions change the type (see Fig. 2). Since the complete proof is long and relatively technical, we sketch its main ideas in the next subsection.

A.1.1 Basic ideas of the proof of regularity in a neighbourhood of the corner points

We apply the method, developed by Kondrat'ev, Kozlov, Kufner, Märkl, Mazya, Oleinik, Orlt, Rosman and Sändig, whose principles are explained e.g. in [12], [13], [14], [15], [21], [23] and [24].

The weak solvability of the problem (A.1)–(A.4) is known. It is explained above that in order to prove the regularity of the weak solution in the whole domain Ω, it remains to verify the regularity in some neighbourhood of point A. Recall that A is the point on the boundary, where the boundary conditions change the type. At first we localize the boundary value problem (A.1)–(A.4) in the neighbourhood of A by means of an appropriate cut-off function η (by analogy with the steps described above). We choose the origin of the coordinate system to be identical with point A (see Fig. 2). Suppose that the cut–off function $\eta = \eta(|\boldsymbol{x}|) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ satisfies $0 \leq \eta(|\boldsymbol{x}|) \leq 1$ and

$$\eta(|\boldsymbol{x}|) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for} \quad |\boldsymbol{x}| < \delta/2, \\ 0 & \text{for} \quad |\boldsymbol{x}| > \delta. \end{cases} \tag{A.16}$$

(Here δ is a positive number so small that A is the only corner point in the circle $\{\boldsymbol{x} : |\boldsymbol{x}| \leq \delta\}$.)

Denote $\boldsymbol{w} = \eta\boldsymbol{\vartheta}$ and $Q = \eta q$. Let $\mathcal{K}$ be the angle of the size $\pi/2$, enclosed by the two perpendicular tangential vectors to $\partial\Omega$ at point A. Since $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, q)$ solves equations (A.1)–(A.2), $(\boldsymbol{w}, Q)$ satisfies equations (A.19) and (A.20) in $\mathcal{K}$.

Let $\tilde{S} = \{(\xi, \omega) : \xi \in \mathbb{R},\, 0 < \omega < \pi/2\}$ be an infinite strip (see Fig. 4). By means of the change of coordinates $(x_1, x_2) \to (\xi, \omega)$, where (r, ω) are the polar coordinates with the origin A and $\xi = \log r$, we transform the pair $(\boldsymbol{w}, Q)$ to the pair $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{w}}, \tilde{Q})$. We shall see in subsection A.2 that $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{w}}, \tilde{Q})$ solves the equations (A.25)–(A.27) (the so called model problem) in $\tilde{S}$.

Applying the complex Fourier transform (see [21, Chapter I, Section I], with respect to the variable ξ, we transform the pair $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{w}}, \tilde{Q})$ (of the variables ξ, ω) to the pair $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}, \widehat{Q})$ (depending on λ, ω). If we

consider λ to be fixed then $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}, \widehat{Q})$, satisfy, as functions of only one variable ω, the system of three ordinary differential equations (A.28)–(A.30) on the interval $(0, \pi/2)$ with parameter λ (see equations (A.28)–(A.30) in subsection A.2). This system can be written in the form of one operator equation $\mathcal{A}(\lambda)(\hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_2, \hat{Q}) = (\hat{G}_1, \hat{G}_2, \hat{H})$, where the mapping

$$\lambda \to \mathcal{A}(\lambda) : W^{2,2}((0;\pi/2))^2 \times W^{1,2}((0;\pi/2)) \to L^2((0;\pi/2))^2 \times W^{1,2}((0;\pi/2))$$

is defined by (A.31) for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.



Figure 2: Localization of the problem near the corner point A where the boundary conditions change their type.

Transforming the boundary conditions to the same way, we receive the boundary conditions (A.36)–(A.37) (for $\omega = 0$) and (A.38)–(A.39) (for $\omega = \pi/2$). Further, we define certain matrix operators

$$\mathcal{B}_{DN,1}(\lambda) : W^{2,2}((0;\pi/2))^2 \times W^{1,2}((0;\pi/2)) \to \mathbb{C}^2,$$
$$\mathcal{B}_{DN,2}(\lambda) : W^{2,2}((0;\pi/2))^2 \times W^{1,2}((0;\pi/2)) \to \mathbb{C}^2,$$

associated with the boundary conditions (A.36)–(A.37) and (A.38)–(A.39), see (A.40) and (A.41) for details. These operators naturally depend on parameter λ. Then we put

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda) := [\mathcal{A}(\lambda);\, \mathcal{B}_{DN,1}(\lambda);\, \mathcal{B}_{DN,2}(\lambda)]$$

for $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ (see (A.42)). Operator $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)$ maps $W^{2,2}(0,\pi/2)^2 \times W^{1,2}(0,\pi/2)$ into $L^2(0,\pi/2)^2 \times W^{1,2}(0,\pi/2) \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2$.

The parameter dependent operator $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)$ is a so called pencil operator corresponding to the problem (A.1)–(A.4). Note that it is possible to define the pencil operator at every boundary point for every elliptic boundary value problem in the sense of Agnon, Douglis and Nirenberg. Note further that every generalized steady Stokes system (with arbitrary type of boundary conditions) is elliptic boundary value problems in the sense of Agnon, Douglis and Nirenberg. Now we define its eigenvalues and simple eigenvalues.

Definition A.2 *The complex number $\lambda = \lambda_0$ is an eigenvalue of $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)$ if there exists a nontrivial solution $\widehat{\boldsymbol{U}}(.,\lambda_0) \in \mathscr{D}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda))$ which is holomorphic at λ_0, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{U}}(.,\lambda_0) \neq \boldsymbol{0}$, and $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda_0)\widehat{\boldsymbol{U}}(.,\lambda_0) = \boldsymbol{0}$. $\widehat{\boldsymbol{U}}(.,\lambda_0) = \widehat{\boldsymbol{U}}(\omega,\lambda_0)$ is an eigenfunction of $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda_0)$ with respect to λ_0.*

Definition A.3 *Let λ_0 be an eigenvalue of $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)$. We say that it is a simple eigenvalue if $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}'(\lambda_0)\widehat{\boldsymbol{U}}(.,\lambda_0) = \boldsymbol{0}$ only for $\widehat{\boldsymbol{U}}(.,\lambda_0) = \boldsymbol{0}$.*

Note (see e.g. in [12], [13], [14]) that if λ is not an eigenvalue of $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}$, then operator $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)$ is an isomorphism between spaces $W^{2,2}(0,\pi/2)^2 \times W^{1,2}(0,\pi/2)$ and $L^2(0,\pi/2)^2 \times W^{1,2}(0,\pi/2) \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2$.

The main proposition of this section (Theorem A.1) is based on Theorem A.8. To prove Theorem A.8 we will apply the following theorem which is the simplified version of Theorems 1.4.3 and 1.4.4 in [15].

Theorem A.4 (Regularity and a priori estimate) *Let $(\overline{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}, \overline{q}) \in W^{1,2}(\Omega)^2 \times L^2(\Omega)$ be the weak solution of some generalized steady Stokes systems with a right hand side $\overline{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = (\overline{\sigma_1}, \overline{\sigma_2}, \overline{\sigma_3}) \in L^p(\Omega)^2 \times W^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $p > 1$, $A \in \partial\Omega$. Denote by $\widehat{\mathcal{B}} = \widehat{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda)$ its corresponding pencil operator. Then the following propositions hold:*

- *Assume that λ_0 is the only eigenvalue of $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda)$ in the strip $\operatorname{Im}\lambda \in (2/p-2,0)$. Suppose additionally that this eigenvalue is simple. Assume that the lines $\operatorname{Im}\lambda = 0$ and $\operatorname{Im}\lambda = 2/p-2$ are free of eigenvalues of the pencil operator $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda)$. Then there exists a cut-off function $\eta = \eta(r)$ and $\delta > 0$ (see (A.16)) such that $(\overline{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}, \overline{q}) = (\overline{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}(r,\omega), \overline{q}(r,\omega))$ admits in a neighborhood $\mathcal{O}$ of the corner point A the asymptotic representation*

$$\eta(r) \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}} \\ \overline{q} \end{pmatrix} = c \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_{sing} \\ \overline{q}_{sing} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_{reg} \\ \overline{q}_{reg} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{A.17}$$

where $\left(\overline{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_{reg}, \overline{q}_{reg}\right) \in W^{2,p}(\Omega_\delta)^2 \times W^{1,p}(\Omega_\delta)$ and $\Omega_\delta = U_\delta(A) \cap \Omega$. Constant c is called generalized intensity factor and the corresponding singular function is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_{sing} \\ \overline{q}_{sing} \end{pmatrix} = r^{i\lambda} \begin{pmatrix} \dot{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}} \\ r^{-1}\dot{q} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $(\dot{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}, \dot{q}) = (\dot{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}(\omega), \dot{q}(\omega))$ is the corresponding eigenfunction of $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}(\lambda_0)$.

- *Suppose that the line $\operatorname{Im}\lambda = 2/p-2$ does not contain eigenvalues of the pencil operator $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)$ and $(\overline{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}, \overline{q}) \in W^{2,p}(\Omega_\delta)^2 \times W^{1,p}(\Omega_\delta)$. Then*

$$\|\overline{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}\|_{W^{2,p}(\Omega_A)^2} + \|\overline{q}\|_{W^{1,p}(\Omega_A)} \le c_{10} \|\overline{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\|_{L^p(\Omega)^2}, \tag{A.18}$$

where $\Omega_A = U_\tau(A) \cap \Omega$ for some $\tau < \delta/2$ and $c_{10} = c_{10}(\Omega_\delta, \tau)$.

Remark A.5 *Since (A.1)–(A.4) represents an elliptic boundary value problem in the sense of Agmon, Douglis and Nirenberg, $\overline{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_1 = \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_1$, $\overline{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}_2 = \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_2$ and $\overline{q} = q$, we can apply the previous theorem for our problem.*

Remark A.6 *Note that we use Fourier transform instead of Mellin transform used in [14, 15, 24]. Consequently, we study the existence of eigenvalues in the strip $\operatorname{Im}\lambda \in (-1-\varepsilon, 0)$ instead of $\operatorname{Re}\lambda \in (0, 1+\varepsilon)$ for sufficiently small ε. (For detailed theory of boundary value problems in nonsmooth domains based on Fourier technique see [12, 13, 21].)*

We will show (see Remark A.7) that only the simple eigenvalue $\lambda_0 = -\mathrm{i}$ is situated in the strip $\operatorname{Im}\lambda \in [-1-\varepsilon, 0)$ choosing $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small.

A.1.2 The pencil operator

Our aim in this subsection is to derive the pencil operator for our problem. Consider the weak solution $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, q)$ of (A.1)–(A.4). Suppose additionally (only in this subsection) that $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, q) \in W^{2,2}(\Omega)^2 \times W^{1,2}(\Omega)$. Choose the origin O at the point A with an angle $\pi/2$ and multiply the equations (A.1)–(A.2) by the "cut off function" η. Remind $\boldsymbol{w} = \eta\boldsymbol{\vartheta}$ and $Q = \eta q$. Further, denote by $\mathcal{K}$ an infinite angle with the vertex $O \equiv A$ and size $\pi/2$. Then we have

$$-\Delta \boldsymbol{w} + \nabla Q = \boldsymbol{g} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{K}, \tag{A.19}$$

$$\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{w} = h \quad \text{in} \quad \mathcal{K}, \tag{A.20}$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{g} = -\boldsymbol{\vartheta}\Delta\eta - 2\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\vartheta}}{\partial x_1}\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial x_1} - 2\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\vartheta}}{\partial x_2}\frac{\partial \eta}{\partial x_2} + \boldsymbol{\sigma}\eta + (\nabla\eta)q, \quad h = \boldsymbol{\vartheta} \cdot (\nabla\eta) \tag{A.21}$$

and $\boldsymbol{g} \in L^2(\mathcal{K})^2$, $h \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{K})$, $\boldsymbol{w} \in W^{2,2}(\mathcal{K})^2$, $Q \in W^{1,2}(\mathcal{K})$. The behavior of $\boldsymbol{w} = \eta\boldsymbol{\vartheta}$ and $Q = \eta q$ near O characterizes the regularity of $\boldsymbol{u}$ and q in a neighborhood of the point A.

Under the polar coordinates (r, ω) the Stokes problem (A.19)–(A.20) becomes

$$-\left(\frac{\partial^2 \bar{w}_1}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial \bar{w}_1}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r^2}\frac{\partial^2 \bar{w}_1}{\partial \omega^2}\right) + \frac{\partial \bar{Q}}{\partial r}\cos\omega - \frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial \bar{Q}}{\partial \omega}\sin\omega = \bar{g}_1(r,\omega), \tag{A.22}$$

$$-\left(\frac{\partial^2 \bar{w}_2}{\partial r^2} + \frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial \bar{w}_2}{\partial r} + \frac{1}{r^2}\frac{\partial^2 \bar{w}_2}{\partial \omega^2}\right) + \frac{\partial \bar{Q}}{\partial r}\sin\omega + \frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial \bar{Q}}{\partial \omega}\cos\omega = \bar{g}_2(r,\omega), \tag{A.23}$$

$$\frac{\partial \bar{w}_1}{\partial r}\cos\omega - \frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial \bar{w}_1}{\partial \omega}\sin\omega + \frac{\partial \bar{w}_2}{\partial r}\sin\omega + \frac{1}{r}\frac{\partial \bar{w}_2}{\partial \omega}\cos\omega = \bar{h}(r,\omega) \tag{A.24}$$

that holds in $\bar{S}$, where $\bar{S} = \{(r,\omega) : 0 < r < \infty,\, 0 < \omega < \pi/2\}$ is the infinite angle described in polar coordinates (r,ω) (see Fig. 3), $\bar{\boldsymbol{w}}(r,\omega) = \boldsymbol{w}(x_1,x_2)$, $\bar{Q}(r,\omega) = Q(x_1,x_2)$, $\bar{\boldsymbol{g}}(r,\omega) = \boldsymbol{g}(x_1,x_2)$, $\bar{h}(r,\omega) = h(x_1,x_2)$.



Figure 3: The infinite half–strip $\bar{S}$.



Figure 4: The infinite strip $\tilde{S}$.

Using the substitution $r = e^{\xi}$ we get

$$-\left(\frac{\partial^2\tilde{w}_1}{\partial\xi^2} + \frac{\partial^2\tilde{w}_1}{\partial\omega^2}\right) + \left(\frac{\partial\tilde{Q}}{\partial\xi} - \tilde{Q}\right)\cos\omega - \frac{\partial\tilde{Q}}{\partial\omega}\sin\omega = \widetilde{G}_1(\xi,\omega), \tag{A.25}$$

$$-\left(\frac{\partial^2\tilde{w}_2}{\partial\xi^2} + \frac{\partial^2\tilde{w}_2}{\partial\omega^2}\right) + \left(\frac{\partial\tilde{Q}}{\partial\xi} - \tilde{Q}\right)\sin\omega + \frac{\partial\tilde{Q}}{\partial\omega}\cos\omega = \widetilde{G}_2(\xi,\omega), \tag{A.26}$$

$$\frac{\partial\tilde{w}_1}{\partial\xi}\cos\omega - \frac{\partial\tilde{w}_1}{\partial\omega}\sin\omega + \frac{\partial\tilde{w}_2}{\partial\xi}\sin\omega + \frac{\partial\tilde{w}_2}{\partial\omega}\cos\omega = \widetilde{H}(\xi,\omega) \tag{A.27}$$

that holds in $\tilde{S} = \{(\xi,\omega) : \xi \in \mathbb{R},\, 0 < \omega < \pi/2\}$ (see Fig. 4), $\tilde{\boldsymbol{w}}(\xi,\omega) = \boldsymbol{w}(x_1,x_2)$, $\tilde{Q}(\xi,\omega) = e^{\xi}Q(x_1,x_2)$, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{g}}(\xi,\omega) = \boldsymbol{g}(x_1,x_2)$, $\tilde{h}(\xi,\omega) = h(x_1,x_2)$, $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{G}}(\xi,\omega) = e^{2\xi}\tilde{\boldsymbol{g}}(\xi,\omega)$, $\widetilde{H}(\xi,\omega) = e^{\xi}\tilde{h}(\xi,\omega)$. Note that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{w}} \in W^{2,2}(\tilde{S})^2$, $\tilde{Q} \in W^{1,2}(\tilde{S})$, $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{G}} \in L^2(\tilde{S})^2$, $\widetilde{H} \in W^{1,2}(\tilde{S})$. Applying complex Fourier transform with respect to ξ for suitable $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, we get the following system of three ordinary differential equations depending on a parameter λ with unknown functions $\widehat{w}_1$, $\widehat{w}_2$ and $\widehat{Q}$

$$-\frac{\partial^2\widehat{w}_1}{\partial\omega^2} - (\mathrm{i}\lambda)^2(\widehat{w}_1) + (\mathrm{i}\lambda - 1)\widehat{Q}\cos\omega - \frac{\partial\widehat{Q}}{\partial\omega}\sin\omega = \widehat{G}_1(\lambda,\omega), \tag{A.28}$$

$$-\frac{\partial^2\widehat{w}_2}{\partial\omega^2} - (\mathrm{i}\lambda)^2(\widehat{w}_2) + (\mathrm{i}\lambda - 1)\widehat{Q}\sin\omega + \frac{\partial\widehat{Q}}{\partial\omega}\cos\omega = \widehat{G}_2(\lambda,\omega), \tag{A.29}$$

$$(\mathrm{i}\lambda)(\widehat{w}_1)\cos\omega - \frac{\partial\widehat{w}_1}{\partial\omega}\sin\omega + (\mathrm{i}\lambda)(\widehat{w}_2)\sin\omega + \frac{\partial\widehat{w}_2}{\partial\omega}\cos\omega = \widehat{H}(\lambda,\omega) \tag{A.30}$$

that holds in the interval $(0,\pi/2)$, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} = \mathcal{F}_{\xi\to\lambda}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{G}})$, $\widehat{H} = \mathcal{F}_{\xi\to\lambda}(\widetilde{H})$, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}} = \mathcal{F}_{\xi\to\lambda}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{w}})$, $\widehat{Q} = \mathcal{F}_{\xi\to\lambda}(\tilde{Q})$. Note that for the complex parameter λ we have $\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}} \in W^{2,2}((0;\pi/2))^2$, $\widehat{Q} \in W^{1,2}((0;\pi/2))$, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{G}} \in L^2((0;\pi/2))^2$, $\widehat{H} \in W^{1,2}((0;\pi/2))$.

Denote by $\mathcal{A}(\lambda) : W^{2,2}((0;\pi/2))^2 \times W^{1,2}((0;\pi/2)) \to L^2((0;\pi/2))^2 \times W^{1,2}((0;\pi/2))$ the matrix operator which corresponds to system (A.28)–(A.30) , i.e.

$$\mathcal{A}(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\partial}{\partial\omega^2} - (i\lambda)^2 & 0 & (i\lambda-1)\cos\omega - \sin\omega\frac{\partial}{\partial\omega} \\ 0 & -\frac{\partial}{\partial\omega^2} - (i\lambda)^2 & (i\lambda-1)\sin\omega + \cos\omega\frac{\partial}{\partial\omega} \\ (i\lambda)\cos\omega - \sin\omega\frac{\partial}{\partial\omega} & (i\lambda)\sin\omega + \cos\omega\frac{\partial}{\partial\omega} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{A.31}$$

We considered this operator for all parameter $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$.

The mixed boundary conditions

"Localizing" the problem, introducing polar coordinates (r, ω) and substituting $r = e^{\xi}$ we get the mixed boundary conditions (A.4) at the point $\omega = 0$ and $\omega = \pi/2$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \tilde{w}_1}{\partial \omega}(\xi, 0) &= 0, && \text{(A.32)} \\ -(\tilde{Q}e^{\xi})(\xi, 0) + \frac{\partial \tilde{w}_2}{\partial \omega}(\xi, 0) &= 0, && \text{(A.33)} \\ \tilde{w}_1(\xi, \pi/2) &= 0, && \text{(A.34)} \\ \tilde{w}_2(\xi, \pi/2) &= 0 && \text{(A.35)} \end{aligned}$$

and using the Fourier transform with respect to ξ, (A.32)–(A.35) read

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \widehat{w}_1}{\partial \omega}(\lambda, 0) &= 0, && \text{(A.36)} \\ \frac{\partial \widehat{w_2}}{\partial \omega}(\lambda, 0) - \widehat{Q}(\lambda, 0) &= 0, && \text{(A.37)} \\ \widehat{w}_1(\lambda, \pi/2) &= 0, && \text{(A.38)} \\ \widehat{w}_2(\lambda, \pi/2) &= 0. && \text{(A.39)} \end{aligned}$$

Denote by $\mathcal{B}_{DN,1}(\lambda)$ the operator of the boundary conditions of mixed type (A.36)–(A.39) written in the matrix form for $\omega = 0$ (Neumann type condition)

$$\mathcal{B}_{DN,1}(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega}\big|_0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega}\big|_0 & -\underline{1}\big|_0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{A.40}$$

and $\mathcal{B}_{DN,2}(\lambda)$ for $\omega = \pi/2$ (Dirichlet condition)

$$\mathcal{B}_{DN,2}(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \underline{1}\big|_{\frac{\pi}{2}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \underline{1}\big|_{\frac{\pi}{2}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{A.41}$$

Remind that $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)$ is the parameter dependent operator which is defined by

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda) = [\mathcal{A}(\lambda);\, \mathcal{B}_1(\lambda);\, \mathcal{B}_2(\lambda)]\,. \tag{A.42}$$

$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)$ is considered for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and it corresponds to the problem (A.28)–(A.30) with the boundary conditions (A.36)–(A.39).

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda) : W^{2,2}((0;\pi/2))^2 \times W^{1,2}((0;\pi/2)) \to L^2((0;\pi/2))^2 \times W^{1,2}((0;\pi/2)) \times \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^2. \tag{A.43}$$

A.1.3 Calculation of the characteristic determinants to the Stokes flows and a regularity result for the stationary Stokes problem

Denote by $[\hat{e}_1;\, \hat{e}_2;\, \hat{e}_p]$ the general solution of the system (A.28)–(A.30) with the vanishing right hand side, where $\hat{e}_1$, $\hat{e}_2$ stand for $\widehat{w}_1$, $\widehat{w}_2$ and $\hat{e}_p$ stands for $\widehat{Q}$, respectively. The general solution $[\hat{e}_1;\, \hat{e}_2;\, \hat{e}_p]$ has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{e}_1 \\ \hat{e}_2 \\ \hat{e}_q \end{pmatrix} &= C_1 \begin{pmatrix} \cos(i\lambda\omega) \\ -\sin(i\lambda\omega) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + C_2 \begin{pmatrix} \sin(i\lambda\omega) \\ \cos(i\lambda\omega) \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad + C_3 \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{i\lambda}{2}\cos[(i\lambda-2)\omega] \\ \sin(i\lambda\omega) + \frac{i\lambda}{2}\sin[(i\lambda-2)\omega] \\ -2i\lambda\cos[(i\lambda-1)\omega] \end{pmatrix} + C_4 \begin{pmatrix} \frac{i\lambda}{2}\sin[(i\lambda-2)\omega] \\ \cos(i\lambda\omega) + \frac{i\lambda}{2}\cos[(i\lambda-2)\omega] \\ 2i\lambda\sin[(i\lambda-1)\omega] \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{A.44}$$

for $\lambda \neq 0$ and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{e}_1 \\ \hat{e}_2 \\ \hat{e}_q \end{pmatrix} = C_1 \begin{pmatrix} \cos(2\omega) \\ \sin(2\omega) - 2\omega \\ 4\cos\omega \end{pmatrix} + C_2 \begin{pmatrix} -\sin(2\omega) - 2\omega \\ \cos(2\omega) \\ -4\sin\omega \end{pmatrix} + C_3 \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + C_4 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{A.45}$$

for $\lambda = 0$. Remark that $\lambda = 0$ is not an eigenvalue of the pencil $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)$. Recall that every $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\ker \widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda_0) \neq \{\mathbf{0}\}$ is said to be an eigenvalue of $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)$. The distribution of the eigenvalues of the operator $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)$ plays crucial role in the regularity results of the solution, see Theorem A.8.

Substituting the general solution (A.44) and (A.45) into the corresponding boundary conditions (A.36)–(A.39) we get a linear system of four homogenous equations with unknowns C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 and with parameter λ. The eigenvalues of $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)$ are zeros of the determinant $D(\lambda)$ of the matrix corresponding to the system mentioned above. Omitting numerous technicalities the resulting determinant $D(\lambda)$ reads as follows:

$$D(\lambda) = \begin{vmatrix} 0 & 4-i\lambda & 0 & -2+i\lambda \\ 2+i\lambda & 0 & 4+i\lambda & 0 \\ d_{31} & d_{32} & d_{33} & d_{34} \\ d_{41} & d_{42} & d_{43} & d_{44} \end{vmatrix} = 0, \tag{A.46}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} d_{31} &= \cos(\tfrac{i\lambda\pi}{2}) - \tfrac{i\lambda}{2}\cos[(i\lambda-2)\tfrac{\pi}{2}], & d_{41} &= \tfrac{i\lambda}{2}\sin[(i\lambda-2)\tfrac{\pi}{2}], \\ d_{32} &= \sin(\tfrac{i\lambda\pi}{2}) - \tfrac{i\lambda}{2}\sin[(i\lambda-2)\tfrac{\pi}{2}], & d_{42} &= -\tfrac{i\lambda}{2}\cos[(i\lambda-2)\tfrac{\pi}{2}], \\ d_{33} &= -\tfrac{i\lambda}{2}\cos[(i\lambda-2)\tfrac{\pi}{2}], & d_{43} &= \sin(\tfrac{i\lambda\pi}{2}) + \tfrac{i\lambda}{2}\sin[(i\lambda-2)\tfrac{\pi}{2}], \\ d_{34} &= \tfrac{i\lambda}{2}\sin[(i\lambda-2)\tfrac{\pi}{2}], & d_{44} &= \cos(\tfrac{i\lambda\pi}{2}) + \tfrac{i\lambda}{2}\cos[(i\lambda-2)\tfrac{\pi}{2}]. \end{aligned}$$

Computation of (A.46) leads to the transcendent equation

$$(i\lambda)^2 - 4\cos^2\left[(i\lambda)\frac{\pi}{2}\right] - \sin^2\left[(i\lambda)\frac{\pi}{2}\right] = 0. \tag{A.47}$$

The roots of the equation (A.47) are the eigenvalues of $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)$.

Remark A.7 *We show that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that there are no eigenvalues of $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)$ situated in the strip $\mathrm{Im}\lambda \in [-1-\varepsilon, 0)$ with the exception of $\lambda = -i$. It is easy to see that eigenvalue $\lambda = -i$ is simple.*

Let us briefly present the technical procedure. Let $\lambda = a + ib$, where a and b are real numbers. Separating real and imaginary parts in (A.47) we get the following system of nonlinear equations

$$(b^2 - a^2) - \frac{5}{2} = \frac{3}{4}\cos(\pi b)\left(e^{\pi a} + e^{-\pi a}\right), \tag{A.48}$$

$$-2ab = \frac{3}{4}\sin(\pi b)\left(e^{\pi a} - e^{-\pi a}\right). \tag{A.49}$$

The equation (A.49) can be simply modified to a more convenient form

$$\frac{-\pi a}{e^{\pi a} - e^{-\pi a}}\left[\frac{2}{\pi}\right]^2 = \frac{3}{2}\frac{\sin(\pi b)}{\pi b}, \quad a \neq 0,\, b \neq 0. \tag{A.50}$$

It is easy to see that the expression on the left is negative for every $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $a \neq 0$, and the expression on the right is nonnegative for every $b \in [-1, 0)$. Consequently, corresponding λ are not roots of (A.47).

For $\lambda = i\,b$ the left hand side of (A.47) takes the form $b^2 - 1 - 3\cos^2(\frac{\pi\, b}{2})$. This expression is negative for $b \in (-1, 0)$. Therefore, $\lambda = i\,b$, where $b \in (-1, 0)$, are not roots of (A.47).

The equation (A.48) can be written in the form

$$\frac{(b^2 - a^2)}{(e^{\pi a} + e^{-\pi a})} - \frac{5}{2\,(e^{\pi a} + e^{-\pi a})} = \frac{3}{4}\cos(\pi b). \tag{A.51}$$

It is easy to see that there exist $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ and $K > 0$ such that (A.51) does not hold for $|a| > K$ and $b \in (-1-\varepsilon_1, -1)$. Hence, corresponding λ are not roots of (A.47).

Roots if (A.47) are isolated points since the left hand side corresponds to a nonzero holomorphic function defined on the whole C. Consequently, $\lambda = a + i\,b$, where $|a| \le K$ and $b \in (-1-\varepsilon, -1)$ for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_1$, are not roots of (A.47).

All of these facts imply that there are no eigenvalues of $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)$ situated in the strip $\mathrm{Im}\lambda \in [-1-\varepsilon, 0)$ with the exception of $\lambda = -i$.

Let ε mentioned in Remark A.7 be fixed. . Let $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, q)$ be a weak solution of (A.1)–(A.4) with the right hand side $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. Suppose additionally $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in L^{2+\varepsilon}(\Omega)^2$.The cut-off function $\eta(r)$ and number δ was defined in (A.16). Let $\Omega_\delta = \Omega \cap U_\delta(A)$, $\tau < \delta/2$ be fixed and $\Omega_A = \Omega \cap U_\tau(A)$. Theorem A.4 yields the following asymptotic representation in a neighborhood $\mathcal{O}$ of the corner point A

$$\eta(r) \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\vartheta} \\ q \end{pmatrix} = \left[c_1 \begin{pmatrix} r\cos\omega \\ -r\sin\omega \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + c_2 \begin{pmatrix} r\sin\omega \\ r\cos\omega \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + c_3 \begin{pmatrix} -r\cos\omega \\ r\sin\omega \\ -4 \end{pmatrix} + c_4 \begin{pmatrix} -r\sin\omega \\ 3r\cos\omega \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right] + \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{reg} \\ q_{reg} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{(A.52)}$$

with some constants c_1, c_2, c_3 and c_4, where $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}_{reg}, q_{reg}) \in W^{2,2+\varepsilon}(\Omega_\delta)^2 \times W^{1,2+\varepsilon}(\Omega_\delta)$. Now (A.52) immediately yields $\eta(r)\,(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, q) \in W^{2,2+\varepsilon}(\Omega_\delta)^2 \times W^{1,2+\varepsilon}(\Omega_\delta)$. Since the line $\mathrm{Im}\lambda = -1-\varepsilon$ is free of eigenvalues of the pencil operator $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)$ then

$$\|\boldsymbol{\vartheta}\|_{W^{2,2+\varepsilon}(\Omega_A)^2} + \|q\|_{W^{1,2+\varepsilon}(\Omega_A)} \le c_{11}\,\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{L^{2+\varepsilon}(\Omega)^2}, \quad \text{(A.53)}$$

where $\tau c_{11} = c_{11}(\Omega_A)$.

Since $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, q) \in W^{2,2-\varepsilon}(\Omega_\delta)^2 \times W^{1,2-\varepsilon}(\Omega_\delta)$ and the strip $\mathrm{Im}\lambda \in [-1+\varepsilon, 0)$ is free of eigenvalues of the pencil operator $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda)$ then

$$\|\boldsymbol{\vartheta}\|_{W^{2,2-\varepsilon}(\Omega_A)^2} + \|q\|_{W^{1,2-\varepsilon}(\Omega_A)} \le c_{12}\,\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{L^{2-\varepsilon}(\Omega)^2}, \quad \text{(A.54)}$$

where $c_{12} = c_{12}(\Omega_A)$.

Let T_i, $i = 1, 2$, be operators such that

$$T_i(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) := \Big(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, \frac{\partial\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}{\partial x_1}, \frac{\partial\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}{\partial x_2}, \frac{\partial^2\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}{\partial {x_1}^2}, \frac{\partial^2\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}{\partial x_1 \partial 2_2}, \frac{\partial^2\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}{\partial {x_2}^2}, \frac{\partial q}{\partial x_1}, \frac{\partial q}{\partial x_2}\Big)$$

and T_1 and T_2, respectively, are defined on $L^{2-\varepsilon}(\Omega)$ and $L^{2+\varepsilon}(\Omega)$. By (A.53) and (A.54) $T_1 : L^{2-\varepsilon}(\Omega) \to L^{2-\varepsilon}(\Omega_A)^6$, $T_2 : L^{2+\varepsilon}(\Omega) \to L^{2+\varepsilon}(\Omega_A)^6$ and both of them are continuous. Interpolating between them (see [7, Theorem 2.4]) we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem A.8 *Let $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \in L^2(\Omega)^2$ and $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, q) \in V_\kappa \times L^2(\Omega)$ be the solution of* (A.1)–(A.4)*. Let $A \in \partial\Omega$ be the boundary point where the boundary conditions change their type. Then there exists $\Omega_A = U_\tau(A) \cap \Omega$ for sufficiently small τ such that $(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}, q) \in W^{2,2}(\Omega_A)^2 \times W^{1,2}(\Omega_A)$ and the estimate*

$$\|\boldsymbol{\vartheta}\|_{W^{2,2}(\Omega_A)^2} + \|q\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega_A)} \le c_{13}\,\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^2} \quad \text{(A.55)}$$

holds with $c_{13} = c_{13}(\Omega_A)$.

Proof of Theorem A.1follows at once from Theorem A.8, (A.8), (A.13), (A.15) and compactness of $\overline{\Omega}$.

Acknowledgement

The research was supported by the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic, grant No. 13-18652S (author one) and grant No. 13-00522S (author two).

References

[1] AGMON S., DOUGLIS A., NIRENBERG L.: Estimates near the boundary for solutions of elliptic partial differential equations satisfying general boundary conditions. II. Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics, Volume 17, Issue 1, 1964, pp. 35-92.

[2] BENEŠ M., KUČERA P.: Non-steady Navier–Stokes equations with homogeneous mixed boundary conditions and arbitrarily large initial condition. Carpathian Journal of Mathematics. No. 1-2, Vol. 23, 2007, 32-40.

[3] BOCHEV P.B., GUNZBURGER M.D.: Least-Squares Finite Element Methods, Applied Mathematical Sciences 166, 2009.

[4] CIARLET P.G.: Mathematical Elasticity, Vol. I. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1988.

[5] DEURING P., KRAČMAR S.: Exterior stationary Navier–Stokes flows in 3D with non-zero velocity at infinity: approximation by flows in bounded domains. Math. Nachr. 269/270 (2004), 86–115.

[6] DEURING P., KRAČMAR S.: Artificial boundary conditions for the Oseen system in 3D exterior domains. Analysis (Munich) 20 (2000), no. 1, 65–90.

[7] DUOANDIKOETXEA J.: Fourier Analysis. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 29. AMS, Providence, RI, 2001.

[8] FEISTAUER M.: Mathematical Methods in Fluid Mechanics, The Pitman Monographs and Surveys in Pure and Applied Mathematics 67, Longman Scientific and Technical Series, Harlow, 1993.

[9] GALDI G.P.: An Introduction to the Mathematical Theory on the Navier-Stokes Equations. Volume I. Springer, 1994.

[10] GALDI G.P., RANNACHER R., ROBERTSON A.M., TUREK S.: Hemodynamical Flows. Modeling, Analysis and Simulation. Oberwolfach Seminars, Vol. 37. Birkhuser, 2008.

[11] GLOWINSKI R.: Numerical Methods for Nonlinear Variational Problems. Springer, BerlinHeidelberg TokioNew York, 1984.

[12] KONDRAT'EV V.A.: Boundary value problems for elliptic equations on domains with conical or angular points, Trudy Moskov. Mat. Obshch. 16 (1967), Russian.

[13] KONDRAT'EV V.A., OLEINIK O.A.: Boundary-value problems for partial differential equations in non-smooth domains, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk 38:2 (1983), 3-76.

[14] KOZLOV V.A., MAZYA V.G., ROSSMANN J.: Elliptic Boundary Value Problems with Point Singularities, American Mathematical Society, 1997.

[15] KOZLOV V.A., MAZYA V.G., ROSSMANN J.: Spectral Problems Associated with Corner Singularities of Solutions to Elliptic Equations, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 85, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.

[16] KRAČMAR S., NEUSTUPA J.: Global existence of weak solutions of a nonsteady variational inequalities of the Navier–Stokes type with mixed boundary conditions. Proc. of the conference ISNA'92, August-September 1992, Part III, Publ. Centre of the Charles Univ., Prague, 156-157.

[17] KRAČMAR S., NEUSTUPA J.: Modelling of flows of a viscous incompressible fluid through a channel by means of variational inequalities. ZAMM 74, 1994, 6, 637-639.

[18] KRAČMAR S., NEUSTUPA J.: A weak solvability of a steady variational inequality of the Navier–Stokes type with mixed boundary conditions. Proceedings of the Third World Congress of Nonlinear Analysts, Part 6 (Catania, 2000). Nonlinear Anal. 47 (2001), no. 6, 4169–4180.

[19] KUČERA P.: Basic properties of solution of the non-steady Navier-Stokes equations with mixed boundary conditions in a bounded domain, Annali dell Universita di Ferrara, **55**(2009), 289-308.

[20] KUČERA P., SKALÁK Z.: Solutions to the Navier–Stokes Equations with Mixed Boundary Conditions. Acta Applicandae Mathematicae, 275-288, Kluver Academic Publishers, 1998, vol. 54, no. 3.

[21] KUFNER A., SÄNDIG A.-M.: Some Aplications of Weighted Sobolev Spaces, Teubner-Texte zur Mathematik, Band 100, Leipzig 1987.

[22] KUFNER A., JOHN O., FUČÍK S.: Function spaces. Academia, Prague, 1977.

[23] MÄRKL P., SÄNDIG A.-M.: Singularities of the Stokes System in Polygons, Bericht 2008/009 des Instituts für Angewandte Analysis und Numerische Simulation der Universität Stuttgart, 2008.

[24] ORLT M., SÄNDIG A.-M.: Regularity of Viscous Navier–Stokes Flows in Nonsmooth Domains, Boundary Value Problems and Integral Equations in Nonsmooth Domains, Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics, **167** (1993), pp. 185-201.

[25] RANNACHER, R.: Numerical analysis of the NavierStokes equations. Appl. Math. 38, 361 380 (1993)

[26] TAYLOR A. E.: Introduction to functional analysis. Wiley, 1958.

[27] TEMAM R.: Navier–Stokes Equations, theory and numerical analysis, North-Holland Publishinged edition, Company, Amsterodam, New York, Oxford. Revis (1979).